3. The Examiner provided the basis for the rejections under 35 USC § 112 in this Office action. The Applicant believes no response is required for this paragraph.

4. The Examiner rejected claims 13-20 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the preambles of claims 13-20 are indefinite and that it "is unclear as to whether the band is part of the means for holding or the means for fastening or both." The Applicant as requested that these claims to be amended to make more clear that the band is not part of the means for fastening. The Applicant believes that these amendments fully addresses the Examiner's rejection under this paragraph and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

5. The Examiner provided the citation to 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action. The Examiner also notes that the application currently names joint inventors and that the Examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made. The Applicant confirms that the claims of this application were and are commonly at the time the invention was made. Applicant believes that no further response is required for this paragraph.

6. The Examiner rejected claims 13-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier et al. and Szymaszek et al. The Applicant has requested that claim 13, on which claims 14-20 depend, be amended to point out that the plug head band of Applicant's invention is made of a ductile material. Applicant believes that the references, in particular Maier et al., specifically teach away from the use of ductile

material by describing the use of a material that is "substantially free of plastic deformation." See, Maier et al., column 3, lines 40-47. As Applicant has requested that claims 13, on which claims 14-20 depend, be amended to add this element of a ductile material, which Applicant believes is not only not disclosed by any cited or otherwise known reference, but is actually taught away from by the Maier et al. reference, Applicant believes that this requested amendment fully addresses the Examiner's rejections of this paragraph. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

7. The Examiner has listed certain "prior art made of record and not relied upon" which is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. Applicant respectfully requests that all such cited "prior art" be included as references in the Applicant's information disclosure statement.

8. The Examiner has provided information concerning communication and/or inquiries concerning this case. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's willingness to communicate on this case and believes no further response to this paragraph is required.

The Applicant has requested that claims 13-20 be amended as previously described. Applicant believes that these amendments should place this application in a condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, and in summary, Applicant believes that all issues and points of the Examiner's Office Action have been addressed and that all newly-amended

claims as well as claims which are dependent on such newly-amended claims are patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted this 30th day of June, 2000.

Lloyd W. Sadler
Reg. No. 40,154
MCCARTHY & SADLER, LC
39 Exchange Place, Suite 100
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 323-9399
Facsimile: (801) 323-9396

RECEIVED
JUL 10 2000
TC 3700 MAIL ROOM